Message Text

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 STATE 106652

11

ORIGIN PM-03

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 /004 R

66614

DRAFTED BY: PM/ISO:HGHAGERTY APPROVED BY: PM/ISO:GTCHURCHILL

----- 057880

R 072056Z MAY 75 FM SECSTATE WASHDC INFO MAC/SCOTT AFB

CONFIDENTIAL STATE 106652

MAC FOR POLAD

FOLLOWING REPEAT OTTAWA 1675 ACTION SECSTATE INFO AFIS/INH DIA NATO LONDON DTD 05 MAY

QTE

CONFIDENTIAL OTTAWA 1675

E.O. 11652: GDS TAGS: MARR, CA

SUBJ: GOOSE BAY CLOSURE

SUMMARY: US-CANADIAN OFFICIALS MET ON APR 29 TO EXCHANGE INFORMATION ON GOOSE BAY CLOSURE. GOC PLANS MINIMAL CIVILIAN OPERATION AT GOOSE AFTER USAF DEPARTURE. USAF INDICATED CONTINUING NEED FOR MUCH EQUIPMENT AND PLANT ON STANDBY BASIS. EMBASSY SUGGESTS GOC SHOULD BE MADE TO PAY LARGER PORTION OF COSTS. END SUMMARY.

1. USAF AND EMBASSY OFFICERS MET ON APR 29 WITH EXTAFF, MINISTRY OF TRANSPORT AND CANADIAN FORCES PERSONNEL TO DISCUSS GOOSE BAY CLOSURE. MEETING WAS ARRANGED TO EXCHANGE INFORMATION AND WAS NOT A NEGOTIATING SESSION. USAF GAVE BROAD-BRUSH PICTURE OF WHAT IT ANTICIPATES WILL BE ITS REQUIREMENTS AFTER LEASE HAS ENDED, AND PROVIDED CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 STATE 106652

GENERAL TIMETABLE FOR WITHDRAWAL. CANADIANS DID NOT

APPEAR TO HAVE ANY PROBLEM WITH USAF SUGGESTION OF 90-DAY EXTENSION (UNTIL SEPT 1976) FOR FINAL CLOSURE.

2. IN DISCUSSING REQUIRMENTS FOR VARIOUS LEVELS OF OPERATIONS BY SAC, MAC, TAC AND AFSC, USAF INDICATED THAT IT WOULD NEED FACILITIES AT GOOSE MOSTLY IN THE EVENT OF A MAJOR WAR, IN THE EVENT OF A REGIONAL CRISIS SUCH AS MIDDLE EAT, AND FOR ROUTINE TRAINING EXERCISES. AGREEMENTS WOULD HAVE TO BE REACHED BE-TWEEN THE TWO GOVERNMENTS, PRESUMABLY BY EXCHANGE OF DIPLOMATIC NOTES, FOR SPECIAL TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS (E.G. AVAILABILITY OF SPECIAL JET FUEL). USAF DESCRIBED PLANS FOR PHASE-DOWN, DISPOSAL OF USAF ASSETS INCLUDING EXCESS FUEL, AND NEED FOR MAINTENANCE OF PHYSICAL EQUIPMENT, SUCH AS RUNWAY, NAVAIDS, RAMPS, CONTROL TOWERS AND THE LIKE. USAF INDICATED WILLINGNESS TO SEEK FACILITY CONTRATS OF UNDEFINED NATURE TO MAINTAIN BUILDINGS, HANGARS, FUEL SYSTEM, RAMPS AND MAINTENANCE SHOP AREAS. USAF ALSO POINTED OUT MUCH WORK REMAINED TO BE DONE TO IDENTIFY RECOVERABLE ASSETS, PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS, TYPE OF COSTING OPER-TION AND SIMILAR MATTERS. GOC OFFICIALS AU XOFIGE V

3. COMMENT: A) IT IS EVIDENT TO EMBASSY THAT GOC HAS DRAWN UP PLAN FOR USE OF GOOSE BAY AS PURELY CIVILIAN AIRPORT. IT HAS FIGURED, OR WILL FIGURE, COSTS AND REQUIREMENTS FOR SUCH OPERATION. ANY COSTS ABOVE THAT MINIMUM GOC WILL UNDBOUTEDLY SEEK TO PASS ON TO USG.

B) USAF RESIDUAL REQUIREMENTS ABOVE AND BEYOND MOT'S MINIMUM NEEDS INCLUDE MAINTENANCE OF EMPTY HANGARS, EMERGENCY BILLETS FOR 300-400 PERSONNEL, SUPPORT FACILITIES, FUEL STORAGE REQUIREMENTS, NAVAIDS, CONTROL TOWER, RUNWAY CLEARANCE (PARTICULARLY OF SNOW) AND MAINTENANCE. WITH ALL OF THIS TO BE DONE BY CANADIAN CIVILIAN PERSONNEL UNDER CONTRACT IN THE ISOLATED GOOSE BAY ENVIRONMENT, THESE RESIDUAL USAF REQUIREMENTS WOULD BE VERY COSTLY, POSSIBLY NOT APPRECIABLY BELOW PRESENT COSTS. CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 STATE 106652

C) WE QUESTION WHETHER THE UNILATERAL USES THE US IS LIKELY TO BE PERMITTED BY THE GOC TO MAKE OF THE BASE CAN JUSTIFY THE PAYMENT BY THE US OF SUCH AN APPARENTLY HIGH PRICE. EXTAFF OFFICER COMMENTED PRIVATELY TO EMBOFF THAT GOC WOULD OBVIOUSLY HAVE NO PROBLEM WITH USAF USE OF BASE IN EVENT MAJOR WAR OR IF CONTINGENCY REQUIRED NATO OR OTHER SIMILAR

MULTI-LATERAL PARTICIPATION. HOWEVER, IN A "MID-EAST TYPE SITUATION," WHERE US ACTING UNILATERALLY TO IMPLEMENT US POLICY, EXTAFF OFFICIAL SAID GOC MIGHT WELL BE RELUCTANT TO PERMIT USE OF GOOSE. THUS, IF US WERE TO PAY ALL COSTS ABOVE NOT MINIMUM NEEDS, TO THE EXTENT THAT US WILLINGNESS TO PAY WAS BASED ON OUR ASSUMED ABILITY TO USE THE BASE FOR SUCH UNILATERAL CONINGENCIES, WE COULD WELL END UP PAYING FOR A PRODUCT WHOSE DELIVERY WOULD BE DENIED US WHEN WE NEEDED IT.

D) FACED WITH THIS POSSIBILITY, IT WOULD SEEM TO US THAT OUR NEGOTIATING STRATEGY SHOULD BE TO INDICATE TO THE CANADIANS THAT WE CONSIDER THE BASE TO BE OF PRIMARY IMPORTANCE FOR USE IN NATO CONTINGENCIES UP TO AND INCLUDING THE OUTBREAK OF A MAJOR WAR AND OTHER POSSIBLE CONTINGENCIES WHERE US AND GOC NATIONAL INTERESTS WOULD COINCIDE. (EMBASSY NOTES THAT BRITISH RAF CONSIDERS GOOSE ONE OF THE BEST BASES AVAILABLE TO IT FOR TRAINING AND USES IT REGULARLY, PERHAPS BRITISH. AS NATO ALLY, COULD BE REMINDED THAT THEY HAVE VESTED INTEREST IN ITS MAINTENANCE AND SHOULD CONTRIBUTE TO ITS UPKEEP, OR AT LEAST SUPPORT A DEMARCHE TO CANADIANS THAT LATTER SHOULD ASSUME LARGER BURDEN). SINCE FOR NATO OR OTHER MUTUAL-INTEREST USE THE US WOULD BE PROVIDING THE PERSONNEL AND MATERIAL RESOURCES TEMPORARILY REQUIRED T MEET THE CONTINGENCY REQUIREMENT, THE GOC SHOULD BE WILLING TO BEAR THE COSTS OF THE PERMANENT FACILITIES REQUIRED AS PART OF THEIR SHARE OF THE MUTUAL NATO DEFENSE BURDEN.

E) IT WOULD NOT BE INAPPROPRIATE AT THIS POINT OF NEGOTIATIONS TO EMPHASIZE TO GOC THAT WE DO NOT CONSIDER CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 04 STATE 106652

THE SHARE OF THE COMMON DEFENSE BURDEN WHICH THEY ARE PRESENTLY BEARING TO BE COMMENSURATE WITH EITHER THEIR ABILITY TO PAY OR THE DEGREE OF SECURITY THEY RECEIVE FROM THE ALLIANCE. WE COULD THEN INDICATE TO THEM THAT WE WOULD BE WILLING TO SHARE THE COSTS OF THE PERMANENT FACILITIES IF THE GOC WERE WILLING TO PROVIDE ASSURANCE THAT THE US CAN USE THE FACILITIES FOR UNILATERAL CONTINGENCIES, OUR SHARE TO BE COMPUTED ON THE BASIS OF AN AGREED GUESSTIMATE OF THE PERCENTAGE OF BASE OPERATIONS LIKELY TO BE UNILATERAL.

F) EMBASSY AWARE THAT ABOVE SUGGESTION MAY BE DEPARTURE FROM OTHER AGREEMENTS (E.G. COLD LAKE FACILITY). HOWEVER, THIS SHOULD NOT BE SUFFICIENT JUSTIFICATION TO REFRAIN FROM SEEKING ADDITONAL

CANADIAN SUPPORT FOR GOOSE. CANADA WILLINGLY PROVIDED MUCH VALUABLE SUPPORT WHILE SAC WING STATIONED AT GOOSE; SAC DEPARTURE SHOULD NOT BE REASON FOR GOC TO CEASE SUPPORT FOR MILITARY OPERATION. MINIMAL CIVILIAN OPERATION IT APPARENTLY ENVISIONS SHOULD NOT BE ACCEPTED AS ADEQUATE CONTRIBUTION.

G) THIS MESSAGE CLEARED WITH DAO/OTTAWA. JOHNSON UNOTE KISSINGER

CONFIDENTIAL

NNN

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X Capture Date: 01 JAN 1994 Channel Indicators: n/a

Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED

Concepts: MILITARY BASE CLOSINGS, FORCE & TROOP LEVELS, NEGOTIATIONS, GOOSE BAY, MILITARY PLANS

Control Number: n/a Copy: SINGLE Draft Date: 07 MAY 1975 Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960 Decaption Note: Disposition Action: RELEASED

Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: ElyME
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1975STATE106652

Document Number: 1975STATE106652
Document Source: CORE
Document Unique ID: 00 Drafter: PM/ISO:HGHAGERTY

Enclosure: n/a Executive Order: GS Errors: N/A

Film Number: D750161-0309

From: STATE

Handling Restrictions: n/a

Image Path:

Legacy Key: link1975/newtext/t19750572/aaaacoat.tel Line Count: 178 Locator: TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM

Office: ORIGIN PM Original Classification: CONFIDENTIAL Original Handling Restrictions: n/a Original Previous Classification: n/a Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a

Page Count: 4

Previous Channel Indicators: n/a
Previous Classification: CONFIDENTIAL Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a Reference: n/a

Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED Review Authority: ElyME

Review Comment: n/a Review Content Flags: Review Date: 05 MAY 2003

Review Event:

Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <05 MAY 2003 by BoyleJA>; APPROVED <24 SEP 2003 by ElyME>

Review Markings:

Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 05 JÚL 2006

Review Media Identifier: Review Referrals: n/a Review Release Date: n/a Review Release Event: n/a **Review Transfer Date:** Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a

Secure: OPEN Status: NATIVE

Subject: GOOSE BAY CLOSURE SUMMARY: US-CANADIAN OFFICIALS MET ON APR 29 TO EXCHANGE

TAGS: MARR, CA, US To: MAC SCOTT AFB Type: TE

Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 05 JUL 2006